

THOMAS P. GRESSETTE, JR.
Direct: 843.727.2249
Email: Gressette@WGFLAW.com

October 14, 2021

Via Electronic Filing and Overnight Delivery

The Honorable Jocelyn G. Boyd
Chief Clerk and Administrator
Public Service Commission of South Carolina
101 Executive Center Drive, Suite 100
Columbia, SC 29210

RE: *Petition for Declaratory Order with Verification of Orangeburg County Solar Project, LLC and Orangeburg South Solar Project, LLC, both Wholly Owned Subsidiaries of Savion, LLC*, Docket 2021-114-E

Dear Ms. Boyd:

Pursuant to Commission Orders 2021-642 and 2021-129-H, this matter has been scheduled for Virtual Oral Arguments before the Commission on Wednesday, October 20, 2021 at 2:00pm.

Order No. 2021-642 asks the Petitioners to present in advance of the hearing the following additional information related to this matter:

1. Scalable map showing both projects;
2. Project footprint, interconnection location and depiction of outer boundary of the property dedicated to this project; and
3. Information on the design size of the facilities and the operational capacity of the facilities.

With regard to Items 1 and 2, Petitioners herewith file two maps, depicting the information requested. See Exhibit 1 and Exhibit 2. Electronic versions of both maps are being uploaded via the Commission's e-filing system. The maps are designed for viewing in large format on 36" x 24" paper, so we are also sending via overnight delivery 10 paper copies to the Commission (enclosed) and a paper copy to counsel of record. ***It would be very helpful if the Office of the Clerk could assist by providing the maps to each Commissioner and the Hearing Officer in advance of the hearing on October 20, 2021.***

In Item 3, above, the Commission requested information on the design size of the facilities and the operational capacity of the facilities at issue in this matter. The following excerpts highlight information and data relevant to design size and operational capacity of the facilities, as included in the Petitioners' responses to ORS

October 14, 2021
Page 2 of 5

discovery. Along with the above-referenced maps, the indicated responses and cited documents are being filed as exhibits to this letter.

Petitioners' Responses to the South Carolina Office of Regulatory Staff's First Request for Production of Books, Records, and Other Information includes the following:

ORS FIRST REQUEST 1-3:

For both the Orangeburg County Solar Project and the Orangeburg South Solar Project (individually "Project" and collectively "Projects"), please indicate whether the electric generating plant and associated facilities are designed for or capable of being operated at a capacity of more than seventy-five (75) megawatts. Provide detailed explanations for the Petitioners' assertion.

PETITIONERS' RESPONSE TO FIRST REQUEST 1-3:

Orangeburg County Solar Project, LLC and Orangeburg South Solar Project, LLC have requested generation interconnection of 75 megawatts (MW) and 74 MW, respectively, from Santee Cooper. Both Project requests are in the final study phase and are awaiting Interconnection Agreement executions at 75 MW and 74 MW, respectively. Consequently, the Orangeburg County Solar Project and Orangeburg South Solar Project will be limited to 75 MW and 74 MW, respectively.

The inverters of both Projects are equipped with a real power curtailment function that will prevent them from exporting active power over the studied MW values (75 MW for Orangeburg County Solar Project and 74 MW for Orangeburg South Solar Project), which will be made available for review by the host utilities. This active power setting will be only accessible to the inverter vendor engineers or authorized service providers with expressed written consent by the host utilities.

The Response is dated May 25, 2021, and includes the Verification of Scott Zeimetz, Chief Development Officer for Savion, LLC, the company that established Orangeburg County Solar Project, LLC and Orangeburg South Solar Project, LLC for the purpose of developing two solar-powered electric generation projects. See Exhibit 3.

Petitioners' Responses to the South Carolina Office of Regulatory Staff's Second Request for Production of Books, Records, and Other Information includes the following:

ORS SECOND REQUEST 1-1:

Please provide the capacity, both in MWdc and MWac, that is capable of being produced from each electric generating plant and associated facilities?

PETITIONERS' RESPONSE TO SECOND REQUEST 1-1:

Petitioners understand this request to be in regards to accreditable capacity since request (2) below references nameplate capacity. As such, accreditable capacity is a MWac value that is determined at the Point of Interconnection (POI). MWdc is not

October 14, 2021
Page 3 of 5

applicable to accreditable capacity. Regardless, it is normal for solar projects to possess a MWdc rating of the solar panels that is 1.3x to 1.4x that of the MWac rating of the inverters, as this allows for a higher capacity factor without exceeding the POI MWac limitation stated in the GIA. The optimal MWdc:MWac design ratio is determined at a later time and is a function of equipment cost, MWh production, geographic features, site control, off-take agreement terms, finance terms, etc. The accreditable capacity of each electric generating plant and associated facility are listed below:

- Orangeburg County Solar Project (Dominion queue #353): 74.906 MWac
- Orangeburg County Solar Project (Santee Cooper queue #70): 75 MWac
- Orangeburg South Solar Project (Santee Cooper queue #110): 73.98 MWac

ORS SECOND REQUEST 1-2:

What is the nameplate capacity of each Project? If it is different from the capacity stated in AIR 1-3 and/or in (1) above, please provide reasons why.

PETITIONERS' RESPONSE TO SECOND REQUEST 1-2:

The nameplate capacity for each project is listed below:

- Orangeburg County Solar Project (Dominion queue #353): Per Appendix 2 of the Dominion GIA, the project was studied employing 26 Sungrow SG3150 inverters that are power limited to 2.881 MWac each for a total nameplate capacity of 74.906 MWac.
- Orangeburg County Solar Project (Santee Cooper queue #70): Per Appendix A of the Santee Cooper draft GIA, the project was studied employing 30 TMEIC PVL2700GR inverters with a facility rating of 75 MWac net on the Interconnection Customer's.
- Orangeburg South Solar Project (Santee Cooper queue #110): Per Facility Study results tendered October 2020, the GI request was studied with a POI impact of 73.98 MWac. The application consisted of 30 TMEIC PVL2700GR inverters rated 2.5 MWac each.

The Response is dated June 4, 2021, and includes the Verification of Scott Zeimetz, Chief Development Officer for Savion, LLC, the company that established Orangeburg County Solar Project, LLC and Orangeburg South Solar Project, LLC for the purpose of developing two solar-powered electric generation projects. See Exhibit 4.

On June 30, 2021, staff and counsel from ORS, Petitioners, and Intervenors participated in a telephone conference during which the Petitioners further explained their position on why the capacity of the planned

October 14, 2021
Page 4 of 5

facilities is less than the 75 MW trigger for applicability of the Siting Act.¹ Following that call the Petitioners submitted additional information from Emily Truebner, Savion LLC's VP of Permitting and Environmental. Specifically, on July 8, 2021, Ms. Truebner provided documents showing that the Petitioners' position on the capacity of their proposed facilities is consistent with the position the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission ("FERC") takes regarding the same.

The July 8, 2021, submission via email to ORS included the following:

EXCERPT FROM PETITIONERS' EMAIL TO COUNSEL FOR ORS

With regard to [documentation of how FERC defines capacity]:

- Attached you will find FERC's *pro forma* Large Generator Interconnection Agreement.² In the definitions section (pdf page 15), FERC defines Generating Facility and Generating Facility Capacity in the following manner:
 - ♦ Generating Facility: shall mean Interconnection Customer's device for the production and/or storage for later injection of electricity identified in the Interconnection Request, but shall not include the Interconnection Customer's Interconnection Facilities.
 - ♦ Generating Facility Capacity: shall mean the net capacity of the Generating Facility and the aggregate net capacity of the Generating Facility where it includes multiple energy production devices
- Also attached, you will find Dominion Energy South Carolina's Open Access Transmission Tariff In Attachment M: Large Generator Interconnection Procedures³ (pdf page 319), DESC defines Generating Facility and Generating Facility Capacity in the following manner
 - ♦ Generating Facility: shall mean Interconnection Customer's device for the production and/or storage for later injection of electricity identified in the Interconnection Request, but shall not include the Interconnection Customer's Interconnection Facilities. A Generating Facility consists of one or more generating unit(s) and/or storage devices(s) which usually can operate independently and be brought online or taken offline individually.
 - ♦ Generating Facility Capacity: shall mean the net capacity of the Generating Facility and the aggregate net capacity of the Generating Facility where it includes multiple energy production devices
- FERC and DESC both agree that the Generating Facility Capacity is the 'net capacity' of the facility and not the gross capacity. To further illustrate this, the

¹ See S.C. Code § 58-33-20(2)(a) ("The term 'major utility facility' means...electric generating plant and associated facilities designed for, or capable of, operation at a capacity of more than seventy-five megawatts.").

² See Exhibit 5.

³ See Exhibit 6.

October 14, 2021
Page 5 of 5

FERC Form 556⁴ requires facilities to list the maximum gross and maximum net electric power production capacity at the point(s) of delivery (Section 7a-7g). Maximum net electric power production capacity (net capacity) accounts for various losses in the system prior to interconnection.

The Petitioners appreciate the opportunity to submit this information and look forward to the upcoming oral arguments. Should any additional information be required, please contact me by telephone at 843-727-2249 or by email at Gressette@WGFLAW.com. You may also contact Denise Musso by telephone at 843-727-2263 or by email at DMusso@WGFLAW.com.

Sincerely,

/s/
Thomas P. Gressette, Jr.

Enclosures

Exhibit 1: Map 1
Exhibit 2: Map 2
Exhibit 3: Petitioners' Responses to SC ORS's First Request for Production
Exhibit 4: Petitioners' Responses to SC ORS's Second Request for Production
Exhibit 5: Large Generator Interconnection Agreement (Excerpt)
Exhibit 6: Dominion Open Access Tariff (Excerpt)
Exhibit 7: Form 556
Ten Copies of Exhibit 1 and Exhibit 2 – 24" x 36" printed size (to Office of Clerk)

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify I have today, October 14, 2021, caused a copy of this document to be sent via overnight delivery to Andrew M. Bateman and Matthew W. Gissendanner.

/s/ Thomas P. Gressette Jr.

⁴ See Exhibit 7.